MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held In Washington D. C. March 10, 1953

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1953, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, March 10, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi;
Mr. Peets,
Mr. de Weldon,
Mr. Biddle,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on February 3, 1953, were approved.

2. H. R. 1980, "A BILL TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONSTRUCT A BRIDGE OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF JONES POINT, VIRGINIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES", (Exhibit A).

The Secretary reported that this bridge is much needed for the City of Washington to facilitate traffic on U. S. No. 1 extending from New York to Florida; it will divert 10,000 trucks a day from coming into the National Capital. The National Capital Planning Commission has approved the site for the bridge at Jones Point, which marks the southern point of the former Virginia portion of the District of Columbia, south of Alexandria. The bridge would extend from the Shirley Highway in Virginia, along the railroad tracks, and after crossing the Potomac, would connect with the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. The Bill was introduced by Congressman Joel T. Broyhill, who expects to hold Hearings on the Bill soon.

3. SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Secretary stated that the latest Report published by the Commission of Fine Arts (the Fifteenth)

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held In Washington D. C. March 10, 1953

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1953, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, March 10, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Bellusechi;
Mr. Peets,
Mr. de Weldon,
Mr. Biddle,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on February 3, 1953, were approved.

2. H. R. 1980, "A BILL TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONSTRUCT A BRIDGE OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF JONES POINT, VIRGINIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES", (Exhibit A).

The Secretary reported that this bridge is much needed for the City of Washington to facilitate traffic on U. S. No. 1 extending from New York to Florida; it will divert 10,000 trucks a day from coming into the National Capital. The National Capital Planning Commission has approved the site for the bridge at Jones Point, which marks the southern point of the former Virginia portion of the District of Columbia, south of Alexandria. The bridge would extend from the Shirley Highway in Virginia, along the railroad tracks, and after crossing the Potomac, would connect with the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. The Bill was introduced by Congressman Joel T. Broyhill, who expects to hold Hearings on the Bill soon.

3. SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Secretary stated that the latest Report published by the Commission of Fine Arts (the Fifteenth)

Commission of Fine Arts June 30 1953

covered the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1948, and that requests for copies of the Sixteenth Report are being received continually. He stated also that there is much material at hand for an interesting Report, together with illustrations, and that he would be willing to prepare the draft during the coming six or eight months. The Report would cover the period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1954.

The Commission authorized the Secretary to prepare the draft of the Sixteenth Report, and that he could do the work either within or outside of the Office of the Commission.

4. ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE BUILDING (ADDITION): The Commission ratified the action of the Chairman in approving the design for the addition to this building, to be built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest, on the recommendation of the architect members of the Commission. The design was submitted by the Director of Inspection under the provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act, Application No. 1548, dated February 5, 1953.

Mr. Neild had noted that the drawings did not show the material to be used for the exterior of the building. Accordingly, the Secretary called upon the architects, Shreve, Lamb and Harmon, of New York City, to amend the drawings so as to show the material to be used for the exterior; this they did by indicating granite for the base and limestone for the upper part of the building. The Director of Inspection was notified accordingly.

5. ZONING: The Secretary called attention to a notice received from the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia that a meeting is to be held tomorrow, March 11th, and that Chairman Finley had designated him to represent the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting. The important item on the Agenda of the meeting is to consider amending Paragraph 11, Section XIII, of the Zoning Regulations, so as not to permit elevator penthouses over the 130 foot height.

overed the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1948, and that requests for
opies of the Sixteenth Report are being received continually. He stated also
hat there is much material at hand for an interesting Report, together with
llustrations, and that he would be willing to prepare the draft during the
oming six or eight months. The Report would cover the period from July 1,
948, to June 30, 1954.
~~2044, to June 30, 1954.~~

The Commission authorized the Secretary to prepare the draft of the
ixteenth Report, and that he could do the work either within or outside of the
ffice of the Commission.

4. ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE BUILDING (ADDITION): The Commission ratified the action of the Chairman in approving the design for the addition to this building, to be built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest, on the recommendation of the architect members of the Commission. The design was submitted by the Director of Inspection under the provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act, Application No. 1548, dated February 5, 1953.

Mr. Neild had noted that the drawings did not show the material to be used for the exterior of the building. Accordingly, the Secretary called upon the rchitects, Shreve, Lamb and Harmon, of New York City, to amend the drawings so as to show the material to be used for the exterior; this they did by indicating granite for the base and limestone for the upper part of the building. The irector of Inspection was notified accordingly.

5. ZONING: The Secretary called attention to a notice received from the oming Commission of the District of Columbia that a meeting is to be held omorrow, March 11th, and that Chairman Finley had designated him to represent he Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting. The important item on the Agenda f the meeting is to consider amending Paragraph 11, Section XIII, of the Zoning egulations, so as not to permit elevator penthouses over the 130 foot height.

The Commission discussed the subject. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit B).

The Commission asked Mr. Peets to draft a Resolution, which was adopted, as follows:

"The Commission of Fine Arts is not concerned with the legal, financial, or technical aspects of building height limitations. We are concerned only with the aesthetic factor--and in Washington that is a very important one. We believe that Washington is fortunate in being a relatively low construction city. Low construction adds to the city's order and dignity, gives us plenty of light and air, makes an appropriate setting for the monumental buildings and helps to attract visitors.

"In our opinion the present legal height limitations in the Central Area have reached---and perhaps exceeded--the aesthetically desirable limits. We believe that Washington gains aesthetically by every decision that maintains the low construction character of the city."

(The Secretary presented and read this Resolution at the meeting of the Zoning Commission on March 11, 1953).

6. REPORT ON PROPOSED HOSPITAL BUILDING AT FORT BELVOIR: Mr. Neild reported that the day after the meeting of the Commission on February 3, he and Mr. de Weldon visited the Commandant at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to talk with him about the proposed Hospital to be built on the Reservation. Colonel McCutchen, District Engineer, and other members of the Staff, also were present.

Mr. Neild said, "They showed us preliminary or incomplete drawings of the hospital. It is to be constructed of monolithic concrete in parts and other parts of concrete blocks. It is not a building that will stand the test of time as the drawings would indicate and it is certainly a building that is not in keeping with the permanent construction at Fort Belvoir, which is red brick and stone, but they are simple in design and not displeasing.

"I asked General Scott and his aides if it would be possible to ask and receive alternate proposals, construction proposals for use of other materials. They said that it would. It is apparent, from looking at the drawings, if the

The Commission discussed the subject. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit B).

The Commission asked Mr. Peets to draft a Resolution, which was adopted, as follows:

"The Commission of Fine Arts is not concerned with the legal, financial, or technical aspects of building height limitations. We are concerned only with the aesthetic factor--and in Washington that is a very important one. We believe that Washington is fortunate in being a relatively low construction city. Low construction adds to the city's order and dignity, gives us plenty of light and air, makes an appropriate setting for the monumental buildings and helps to attract visitors.

"In our opinion the present legal height limitations in the Central Area have reached--and perhaps exceeded--the aesthetically desirable limits. We believe that Washington gains aesthetically by every decision that maintains the low construction character of the city."

(The Secretary presented and read this Resolution at the meeting of the coming Commission on March 11, 1953).

6. REPORT ON PROPOSED HOSPITAL BUILDING AT FORT BELVOIR: Mr. Weild eported that the day after the meeting of the Commission on February 3, he and r. de Weldon visited the Commandant at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to talk with im about the proposed Hospital to be built on the Reservation. Colonel McCutchen, istrict Engineer, and other members of the Staff, also were present.

Mr. Weild said, "They showed us preliminary or incomplete drawings of the ospital. It is to be constructed of monolithic concrete in parts and other arts of concrete blocks. It is not a building that will stand the test of time s the drawings would indicate and it is certainly a building that is not in eeping with the permanent construction at Fort Belvoir, which is red brick and tone, but they are simple in design and not displeasing.

"I asked General Scott and his aides if it would be possible to ask and eceive alternate proposals, construction proposals for use of other materials. ney said that it would. It is apparent, from looking at the drawings, if the

completed drawings are made general as these preliminary drawings would indicate, a change in material is going to involve a change in construction. In other words, concrete frame of the buildings. I will not go into details of that, but they indicated that it would be done and that they would ask alternate proposals for the use of other materials that would at least harmonize with the materials used in the other permanent buildings on the site.

"We were told that this building is designed as a typical 500-bed hospital, that wherever they may need another one, they will use the same plan,-use it over and over again. Personally, I think the building is entirely unsuited to the site. If drawings are completed as these preliminary drawings (as I will call them) indicate, I don't think it is a first class building at all. I would not design such a building for my section of the country. That is my feeling about it."

The Chairman prepared the draft of a letter, embodying the report of Mr. Neild, to be sent to the Secretary of Defense, protesting against this concrete block type of building in the Fort Belvoir Reservation (Exhibit C).

Mr. de Weldon pointed out that the location is in close proximity to Mount Vernon, Woodlawn and Gunston Hall, and "any tourist who would visit these historic buildings would also, if built as proposed, see this terrible looking hospital. I think the rest of the buildings are in keeping with the general architecture in that part of Virginia,--Georgian in style."

Professor Belluschi said: "I would like to make two minor suggestions, if I may. One is that it will be impracticable to face the building with concrete blocks from the standpoint of moisture penetration and being a bad material from the point of time; and the other one is to say that the building is going to be there for many centuries to come, probably, and that would be regrettable. It is regrettable to think that there is no pride at all in the designing of such buildings, and that pride in building is declining almost from generation to

completed drawings are made general as these preliminary drawings would indicate, a change in material is going to involve a change in construction. In other words, concrete frame of the buildings. I will not go into details of that, but they indicated that it would be done and that they would ask alternate proposals for the use of other materials that would at least harmonize with the materials used in the other permanent buildings on the site.

"We were told that this building is designed as a typical 500-bed hospital, that wherever they may need another one, they will use the same plan,--use it over and over again. Personally, I think the building is entirely unsuited to the site. If drawings are completed as these preliminary drawings (as I will call them) indicate, I don't think it is a first class building at all. I would not design such a building for my section of the country. That is my feeling about it."

The Chairman prepared the draft of a letter, embodying the report of Mr. Neild, to be sent to the Secretary of Defense, protesting against this concrete block type of building in the Fort Belvoir Reservation (Exhibit C).

Mr. de Weldon pointed out that the location is in close proximity to Mount Vernon, Woodlawn and Gunston Hall, and "any tourist who would visit these historic buildings would also, if built as proposed, see this terrible looking hospital. I think the rest of the buildings are in keeping with the general architecture in that part of Virginia,--Georgian in style."

Professor Bellusch said: "I would like to make two minor suggestions, if I may. One is that it will be impracticable to face the building with concrete blocks from the standpoint of moisture penetration and being a bad material from the point of time; and the other one is to say that the building is going to be there for many centuries to come, probably, and that would be regrettable. It is regrettable to think that there is no pride at all in the designing of such buildings, and that pride in building is declining almost from generation to

generation until we have the cheapest and ugliest kind of buildings, which are not a credit to architecture nor to us."

Chairman Finley said, "We should say that we regret to see a building erected which would create a precedent for buildings of similar type which would be erected in the future."

Mr. Peets said, "I would like to ask if the matter of moisture was brought up at this conference?"

Mr. Neild replied, "No, I asked to see the wall sections and they were not complete. Of course a building of that sort, with interior wall and separate wall and air space and drainage, you could get by with it but it is still not permanent construction."

Professor Belluschi said, "That is right. If you leave air space between the two walls, if it is a curtain wall, and you try to waterproof it with emulsified asphalt, there are still so many holes in it that it is impossible to prevent water from eventually seeping in."

Mr. Peets said, "I have the feeling that if the argument is based upon aesthetic and historic propriety, the engineers and architects of the staff, who designed the building, would favor it,--I mean there would be nothing that would be a criticism of them; simply that it would cost a little more. Secretary Wilson might say, 'I guess we can afford it, go ahead.' But if you put in that item about the engineering factor, then they are bound to fight back and oppose the change."

Professor Belluschi replied, "I don't follow that at all. My point of view is that they were forced for economy's sake only and, as anybody knows, that kind of blocks is much harder to make into good construction; there is no economy about it, and therefore, without over-burdening or making too much of an issue of that, I suggest we say that, besides not being good construction, it is also not an attractive one."

peration until we have the cheapest and ugliest kind of building, which are not a credit to architecture nor to us."

Chairman Finley said, "We should say that we regret to see a building erected which would create a precedent for buildings of similar type which would be erected in the future."

Mr. Peets said, "I would like to ask if the matter of moisture was brought up at this conference?"

Mr. Neild replied, "No, I asked to see the wall sections and they were not complete. Of course a building of that sort, with interior wall and separate wall and air space and drainage, you could get by with it but it is still not permanent construction."

Professor Bellmesh said, "That is right. If you leave air space between two walls, if it is a curtain wall, and you try to waterproof it with emulsified asphalt, there are still so many holes in it that it is impossible to prevent water from eventually seeping in."

Mr. Peets said, "I have the feeling that if the argument is based upon aesthetic and historic property, the engineers and architects of the staff, who designed the building, would favor it,--I mean there would be nothing that would be a criticism of them; simply that it would cost a little more. Secretary Wilson might say, 'I guess we can afford it, go ahead.' But if you put in that item about the engineering factor, then they are bound to fight back and oppose the change."

Professor Bellmesh replied, "I don't follow that at all. My point of view is that they were forced for economy's sake only and, as anybody knows, that kind of blocks is much harder to make into good construction; there is no economy about it, and therefore, without over-burdening or making too much of an issue of that, I suggest we say that, besides not being good construction, it is also not an attractive one."

Mr. Peets commented, "Then I still question the matter. Let us say it could be expressed in some such terms as we believe that the engineer, the structural engineer, would probably confirm us in the impression that concrete blocks are less desirable or practical——"

Professor Hudnut said, "I agree with you about that, Mr. Peets. I think it is a mistake to raise an issue on an engineering problem when we have a case won on our own grounds. We don't strengthen our case by referring to the material in that way. You take a chance on irritating them and actually provoking opposition."

The Commission thereupon discussed further possible changes that might be desired in the letter to Secretary Wilson, whereupon it was sent (Exhibit C).

7. COOLING TOWERS, WASHINGTON HOTEL: Mr. A. R. Clas, architect, presented a scheme for additional cooling towers on the Washington Hotel. He. said;

> "At the present time there are two cooling towers here (indicating) on top of the Washington Hotel, and these new cooling towers are to go here (indicating) for structural reasons. The elevator Penthouse comes out this way (indicating) beyond the face of those cooling towers. Here is an elevation; there are the old ones."

From a large photograph Mr. Clas pointed out the hotel and the White House which is not far away. He said the cooling towers would go just beyond the penthouse and that they could be finished in almost any color,—an enameled color to match the brick. It is within the 130-foot height limit. The cooling towers are 10 feet 9 inches high from the roof line. They are back far enough so that they cannot be seen from the street.

Thereupon, on motion properly moved and seconded, the design was approved.

8. NEW AWNING FOR THE WASHINGTON HOTEL: Mr. Clas said that there is an awning over part of the area of the Roof Garden of the Washington Hotel. It is of fabric and has to be replaced every two years; otherwise it begins to look shabby, and it costs about $2500 for a new one. There is also an expense of $200 each spring for putting it up and another $200 to take it down at the end of the summer season. The Manager of the Hotel has been thinking of a metal awning.

Mr. Neild said, "I think if properly designed, a metal awning can be better than a fabric awning. I am familiar with it; I see it often."

Professor Hudnut was of the opinion that a fabric awning could be condemned, but if a metal awning is allowed, the Manager of the Hotel might want to keep it there all the year round and enclose it in glass, so it would add another story to the building.

Mr. Clas felt that this would not be done, since it brings up the question of heating in wintertime. Mr. Clas said further that, if it is to be a metal awning, in aluminum, it should be alumilite, which is an aluminum that is so treated as to take the tinny appearance away.

Professor Belluschi said, "They use also silicate alloy, which gives a gray appearance." Mr. Clas replied that he used that in the Wyatt Building (at 14th Street and New York Avenue, N. W.). Mr. Clas felt if aluminum is used it should be subdued in color.

On the suggestion of Mr. Neild the Commission decided that, if Mr. Clas will go ahead with the awning, he should submit a design and color scheme, etc.

Mr. Clas said he would arrange to do this at the next meeting of the Commission.

9. GARAGE AT 1418 F STREET, N. W. Mr. Clas submitted a sketch for a Garage to be built at 1418 F Street, N. W., to replace existing old buildings between the Willard and Washington Hotels facing F Street. It will not extend through to Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Clas said that he was designing an office building for the south half of that area. The site comes within the Shipstead-Luce Act area; it can be seen from the Treasury Department.

Mr. Clas said, "One of the ideas that we had was to use masonry on the two pylons and use this color of aluminum in the spandrels, continuous spandrels clear across. It faces north so that instead of giving it a dull finish we

will give it this satin finish. Another thing we are considering is to have all of these spandrels in masonry, either stone or a combination of stone and sandstone, or a combination of precast stone. One thing we are doing is, we are keeping the spandrels so high that the tops of the cars will not be seen from the street, excepting, of course, those on the first floor.

Professor Belluschi remarked, "No glass; is it all open?"

Mr. Clas replied, "Yes it is all open; there is no glass. Glass in a garage requires a very elaborate ventilating system and unfortunately they never wash the glass so that it looks worse with glass then without it. The openings are just slots. It is rather difficult to know what to do with a garage other than to keep it simple and attractive in the use of materials."

Professor Hudnut said, "I move we approve it. I think it is too bad we have to have a garage there, but since we do, I see no other way out. I think it is a very good design."

Mr. Neild asked, "You have not determined yet whether you will use aluminum for spandrels or masonry, have you?"

Mr. Clas replied, "That we have not. I tried to get the answer to this question this morning, but couldn't."

Professor Belluschi felt that there should be a little more texture and a little more interest in the design. There was some discussion as to the columns back of the facade.

Professor Hudnut asked, "What limits the height in a building of that kind? Is it the fact that the building would not go higher on a ramp?"

Mr. Clas replied, "Yes, there is no limit for a garage. It could take the same height as any other building, but it would not be economical to operate a garage that is over five or six stories above grade."

Chairman Finley asked, "Even with an elevator?"

Mr. Clas replied, "It is different with an elevator. They have manpower

...ill give it this matin Chair. Another thing we are concerned by is how all ...of these materials in masonry, either stone or a combination of stone and sand-...ick, or a combination of precast stone. Has Lang's new design [illegible] ...mpeding the approvals or does that type of the core still not be seen from ...the street, excepting, of course, those on the first floor.

Professor Bellusohi remarked, "No glass; is it all open?"

Mr. Clas replied, "Yes it is all open; there is no glass. Glass in a ...garage requires a very elaborate ventilating system and unfortunately they ...never wash the glass so that it looks worse than before they started it. The ...openings are just slots. It is rather difficult to know what to do with a ...garage other than to keep it simple and attractive in the use of materials."

Professor Hudmut said, "I move we approve it. I think it is too bad we ...have to have a garage there, but since we do, I see no other way out. I think ...it is a very good design."

Mr. Weild asked, "You have not determined yet whether you will use aluminum ...for spandrels or masonry, have you?"

Mr. Clas replied, "That we have not. I tried to get the answer to this ...question this morning, but couldn't."

Professor Bellusohi felt that there should be a little more texture and a ...little more interest in the design. There was some discussion as to the columns ...back of the facade.

Professor Hudmut asked, "What limits the height in a building of that kind? ...Is it the fact that the building would not go higher on a ramp?"

Mr. Clas replied, "Yes, there is no limit for a garage. It could take the ...same height as any other building, but it would not be economical to operate a ...garage that is over five or six stories above grade."

Chairman Finley asked, "Even with an elevator?"

Mr. Clas replied, "It is different with an elevator. They have manpower

problems and if they get up too high they run ito difficulty with the element of time because it is not possible to get back to the first floor as quickly as desired by the owner of a car."

Chairman Finley said, "I think commercial garages in the heart of a city are very important because there must be some place to park cars. In fact we recognize that, whether we like it or not."

The Secretary asked, "How many cars will that hold?" Mr. Class replied, 322. That is another thing, they do not like to go over 300 because they can handle 350 more economically than if they provide for 400 or 450.

Professor Hudnut said, "They are building two in Boston, downtown, each of them to provide for 600 cars.

Chairman Finley asked, "Are there any more comments on this particular design?" There were none, and thereupon the motion by Dr. Hudnut to approve the design was seconded by Mr. Neild. The vote was unanimously carried.

10. DALECARLIA FILTER PLANT AND PUMPING STATION: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, District Engineer, United States Engineer Office, submitted a design for a new Filter Plant and Pumping Station, to be built at Dalecarlia, on the Maryland side of the Potomac, near the District of Columbia boundary line, and whereby the Washington water supply will be increased to 450 million gallons a day.

Colonel McCutchen said, "We wish to submit to you today the design studies for the pumping station at the Dalecarlia Filter Plant, which is a part of the expansion program of the water supply system for Metropolitan Washington.

"About thirty years ago, the Fine Arts Commission approved the architectural treatment of the present buildings at the Dalecarlia Plant. We have with us some representative pictures of these buildings so that you may see the pattern which we have attempted to fit the new proposed structure.

"I will first call on Mr. E. A. Schmitt to outline to you the engineering considerations that have led us to the location and the general form of the

considerations that have led us to the location and the general form of the
"I will first call on Mr. E. A. Schmitt to outline to you the engineering
we have attempted to fit the new proposed structure.
representative pictures of these buildings so that you may see the pattern which
treatment of the present buildings at the Dalecarlia Plant. We have with us some
"About thirty years ago, the Fine Arts Commission approved the architectural
expansion program of the water supply system for Metropolitan Washington.
for the pumping station at the Dalecarlia Filter Plant, which is a part of the
Colonel McCutchen said, "We wish to submit to you today the design studies
Washington water supply will be increased to 450 million gallons a day.
of the Potomac, near the District of Columbia boundary line, and whereby the
Filter Plant and Pumping Station, to be built at Dalecarlia, on the Maryland side
District Engineer, United States Engineer Office, submitted a design for a new
10. DANCOARIA FILTER PLANT AND PUMPING STATION: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen,
them to provide for 600 cars.
Professor Hudnut said, "They are building two in Boston, downtown, each of
saving 350 more economically than if they provide for 400 or 450.
322. That is another thing, they do not like to go over 300 because they can
recognize that, whether we like it or not."
The Secretary asked, "How many cars will that hold?" Mr. Olmsa replied,
are very important because there must be some place to park cars. In fact we
Chairman Finley said, "I think commercial garages in the heart of a city
him because it is not possible to get back to the first floor as quickly as
mained by the owner of a car."

structure. The treatment here is somewhat unique in that the major part of the structure is underground. I will then ask Mr. George G. Worth to outline to you the architectural and the landscaping features of the structure. First, Mr. Schmitt."

Mr. Schmitt explained in detail the engineering features of the design. This was followed by an explanation by Mr. Worth of the architectural and landscape features of the project. These are attached hereto and made a part of these minutes (Exhibit D).

Chairman Finley considered this to be a good presentation and asked, "Are there any questions?"

Professor Belluschi asked, "Is this the same rendering presented for the bridge a few months ago?" Colonel McCutchen replied, "Mr. Worth, unfortunately, was sick that day and could not attend. He prepared that one also."

Continuing, Professor Belluschi said, "You repeated several times that it was a functional design, which we all agree it is; and also, with the exception that the buildings look like little churches or little meeting houses, it seems to be quite fit. But I think it is very logical to keep in the same spirit as the original buildings."

Mr. Schmitt said, "Some of that was dictated. When you have a crane and a hook to hoist loads you need vertical height and it predicated the height of the building."

Mr. Peets remarked, "Those could be big carriage houses or stables in Georgian architecture. Is it possible to have more trees there?

Mr. Worth replied, "The trees you see there are cherry trees. They are about 25 years old now and I do not know whether we can add any more. I think there are one or two on the other side of that intake structure, but I do not believe that we could plant any more there now."

Mr. Schmitt said, "I will agree with you; it looks very bare and we intend

structure. The treatment here is somewhat unique in that the major part of the structure is underground. I will then ask Mr. George G. Worth to outline to you the architectural and the landscaping features of the structure. First, Mr. Schmidt."

Mr. Schmidt explained in detail the engineering features of the design. [illegible] escape features of the project. These are attached hereto and made a part of these minutes (Exhibit D).

Chairman Finley considered this to be a good presentation and asked, "Are [illegible]?"

Professor Bellmosh asked, "Is this the same rendering presented for the [illegible]?"

Continuing, Professor Bellmosh said, "You repeated several times that it was a functional design, which we all agree it is; and also, with the exception that the buildings look like little churches or little meeting houses, it seems to be quite fit. But I think it is very logical to keep in the same spirit as [illegible]."

Mr. Schmidt said, "Some of that was dictated. When you have a crane and a hook to hoist loads you need vertical height and it predicated the height of the [illegible]."

Mr. Doyle remarked, "These [illegible]

Georgian architecture. Is it possible to have more trees there?

Mr. Worth replied, "The trees you see there are cherry trees. They are about 25 years old now and I do not know whether we can add any more. I think there are one or two on the other side of that [illegible] structure, but I do not believe that we could plant any more there now."

Mr. Schmidt said, "I will agree with you; it looks very bare and we intend

to do a very thorough landscaping job when the structure has been completed. We will be engaged for the next five or ten years constructing various elements around this area and even some of this fill around here (indicating) may not be done for four or five years from now. So when that finally gets completed, we will do a thorough landscaping job.

Mr. Peets said, "I still have the feeling that that construction does not seem to harmonize with the character of the Institution. I will be glad to have our architect members make their comments."

Professor Hudnut said, "Well, I think the character fits the existing buildings. You have a dilemma there. You either harmonize with the old buildings or have something entirely different."

Mr. Peets remarked, "I feel that the extreme simplicity of the buildings as designed---they are large openings--the civic character of them is not in the same scale."

Mr. Neild said, "I think the pattern is set by the old design and that these new designs conform as well as you could expect."

Mr. Biddle remarked, "I like it very much."

Mr. Peets then said, "I concede the point. I think it is going to look very nice."

Mr. Neild thereupon moved that the design be approved. This motion was seconded by Mr. de Weldon and by Mr. Peets. The motion was carried unanimously (Exhibit E).

11. H. J. RES. 157, MARINE MEMORIAL: The Commission considered H. J. Res. 157, which proposes to amend legislation that would permit the selection of a site for the Marine Memorial in the "immediate vicinity" of the District of Columbia. Congressman Robert D. Harrison, of Virginia, requested a Report on the Bill (ExhibitF).

Chairman Finley asked Mr. de Weldon for his views in the matter. Mr. de Weldon said, "The Marine Corps Memorial Foundation desires to have its monument in memory of the Marines who have given their lives since November 10, 1775, to be in the vicinity of Arlington National Cemetery, away from traffic and buildings of the city, so that it is in a quiet place of contemplation where relatives of those who have fallen, who come to visit their graves in Arlington Cemetery, can also go to the Marine Memorial."

With regard to the question asked by Congressman Harrison as to whether or not this Commission's authority goes beyond the confines of the District of Columbia, the Commission answered "Yes." The Commission is required by law to advise in matters pertaining to the Arlington National Cemetery, which is in Virginia; numbers of other instances could be cited.

As to whether or not the Commission could suggest an area adjacent to the District of Columbia, which would be considered suitable for the Marine Memorial, Mr. de Weldon said, "I think the Nevius Tract would be the perfect site for a memorial---the land on the north side and adjacent to the Arlington National Cemetery. The land is now a part of the Park System of the Government."

Mr. Peets said, "I have no protest against the Nevius Tract as a whole, but I would seriously question putting it on the axis extended of the Mall."

Mr. de Weldon replied, "It is not necessary to have it on the axis extended of the Mall. Actually, looking at the Nevius Tract, over further back on the Nevius Tract would be the ideal site, where you could have beautiful landscaping and parade grounds out in front."

It was recalled that the Commission had recommended months ago that the Nevius Tract be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, when an effort was made to try to bring the tract back into the tax structure of Arlington County. In January, 1953, it was made a public park, by Executive Order of

Chairman Finley asked Mr. de Weldon for his views in the matter. Mr. de Weldon said, "The Marine Corps Memorial Foundation desires to have the memorial in memory of the Marines who have given their lives since November 10, 1775, to be in the vicinity of Arlington National Cemetery, near Fort Myer and the buildings of the city, so that it is in a quiet place of contemplation where relatives of those who have fallen, who come to visit Arlington Cemetery, can also go to the Marine Memorial."

With regard to the question asked by Congressman Harrison as to whether or not this Commission's authority goes beyond the confines of the District of Columbia, the Commission answered "Yes." The Commission is required by law to advise in matters pertaining to the Arlington National Cemetery, which is in Virginia; numbers of other instances could be cited.

As to whether or not the Commission could suggest an area adjacent to the District of Columbia, which would be considered suitable for the Marine Memorial, Mr. de Weldon said, "I think the Mevius Tract would be the perfect site for a memorial--the land on the north side and adjacent to the Arlington National Cemetery. The land is now a part of the Park System of the Government."

Mr. Peets said, "I have no protest against the Mevius Tract as a whole, but would seriously question putting it on the axis extended of the Mall."

Mr. de Weldon replied, "It is not necessary to have it on the axis extended of the Mall. Actually, looking at the Mevius Tract, over further back on the Mevius Tract would be the ideal site, where you could have beautiful landscaping and parade grounds out in front."

It was recalled that the Commission had recommended months ago that the Mevius Tract be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, when an effort was made to try to bring the tract back into the tax structure of Arlington County. In January, 1933, it was made a public park, by Executive Order of

President Truman. Also it was recalled that the site had been recommended for the Carillon bells given by the Netherlands Government. The Secretary stated that the bells in that location would be too far away to be heard in the City of Washington.

Mr. Peets, thereupon, called attention to a Memorial suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission months ago. "They went very far with it and got an architect to prepare very nice drawings for buildings, Colonial in character, as well as a Memorial Tower to the five freedoms; the tower was to mark the extension of the axis of the Mall. That seems,to me, a fundamental error of the whole thing; the axis of the Mall does not continue to that point. The Mall stops at the Potomac River. Beyond that there is no relation. The Mall cannot control anything that is a couple of miles away, just because it happens to be on the axis. That would be an undesirable location for any large object. If this placing of the Marine Memorial would end the other proposal it would be a good thing. I think in fact our approval might be based upon this memorial not being constructed if the Marine Memorial is to be there."

Chairman Finley said, "We could stipulate that this monument should not be placed on the axis," and Professor Hudnut remarked, "I think we ought to make it very clear, because it could be misunderstood very easily."

Mr de Weldon said, "There is no intention to place the monument on the axis. It would be a disadvantage to put it on the axis, because looking down the Mall the Lincoln Memorial would hide it; but otherwise it could be seen from a great distance. I think we ought to make that clear in our statement,--that it would be a suitable site for this Memorial, provided it is not placed on the axis."

Chairman Finley asked the Secretary if the Park and Planning Commission is in agreement with that site.

Mr. Caemmerer replied, "The Park and Planning Commission reported months ago in the matter of the Memorial that Mr. Peets mentioned. Mr. Greensfelder,

one of their members, came to the Office one morning when they were having a meeting and spoke to me about it. I gathered from his talk that he was more concerned in having something to show the people of Arlington County and to indicate to them that there is something more important than using that land simply for the site of an Apartment to derive revenue from taxes. The idea of using the site for a great national memorial was emphasized. However, I doubt if the Park and Planning Commission has done anything about it in the way of developing the project, and I doubt if it will ever be done; certainly no legislation has been introduced for it, whereas the Marine Memorial is a definite project on the way to completion."

After some further discussion, the Commission decided to report to Congressman Harrison, as follows:

1. Does the Authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines of the District of Columbia? The answer is, "Yes."

2. With regard to a location for the proposed Marine Memorial, The Commission of Fine Arts suggest placing the Memorial on a location now in Government ownership, such as, for instance, that adjacent to the north boundary of the Arlington National Cemetery. The Memorial should not be placed on the direct axis of the Mall and the Lincoln Memorial.

A letter was sent to Congressman Harrison, accordingly (Exhibit G).

12. KIT CARSON POSTAGE STAMP: About a month ago the Commission received the following Resolution from the Governor of New Mexico.

A MEMORIAL

MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AND THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TO CAUSE A POSTAGE STAMP TO BE ISSUED IN HONOR OF KIT CARSON.

Whereas, Kit Carson was a pioneer of the western part of the United States, an intrepid scout and a great patriot, and

Whereas, Kit Carson is worthy to be honored and remembered by present day Americans as a worthy example of devotion to duty and devotion to country.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission of Fine Arts be and each of them is hereby memorialized to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson, and

Commission of Fine Arts be and each of them is hereby memorialized to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO that the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the

Americans as a worthy example of devotion to duty and devotion to country.

Whereas, Kit Carson was a pioneer of the western part of the United States, an intrepid scout and a great patriot, and

Whereas, All persons in every [illegible] commend [illegible]

MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AND THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TO CAUSE A POSTAGE STAMP TO BE ISSUED IN HONOR OF KIT CARSON.

The following Resolution from the Governor of New Mexico.

A MEMORIAL

12. KIT CARSON POSTAGE STAMP: About a month ago the Commission received a letter was sent to Congressman Harrison, accordingly (Exhibit G).

axis of the Mall and the Lincoln Memorial.

ownership, such as, for instance, that adjacent to the north boundary of the

2. With regard to a decision for the proposed Bonus Memorial, the Commission of Fine Arts suggests placing the Memorial on a location not in conformity

of the District of Columbia? The answer is, "Yes."

1. Does the Authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines

The questions to be followed:

After some further discussion, the Commission decided to report to Congress-

site project on the way to completion."

legislation has been introduced for it, whereas the Marine Memorial is a defi-

developing the project, and I doubt if it will ever be done; certainly no

of the Park and Planning Commission has done anything about it in the way of

using the site for a great national memorial was emphasized. However, I doubt

imply recognize this of an important to another Commission. The idea of

dicate to them that there is something more important than using that land

connected in having something to show the people of Arlington County and to

meeting and ought to be done it. I understand from his letter that he was

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this Memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, to each member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress, and to the Governor and the Secretary of State of the soverign states of Colorado and Kansas.

Chairman Finley stated, that, by letter of February 24, 1953, he informed the Governor of the State of New Mexico, that he would present this Memorial at the next meeting of the Commission on March 10th, and that he could be assured of the cooperation of the Commission in this matter.

The Secretary was asked to make some inquiry at the Post Office Department about this matter and report at the next meeting of the Commission.

13. MEMORIAL TO DR. J. FINLEY WILSON: Under date of January 30, 1953, the following letter was received by the Commission from Honorable William E. Jenner, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate:

> "Enclosed you will find two copies of S. J. Res. 11, introduced by Senator Butler, of Maryland, authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.
> "I would appreciate your comment as to the advisability of the measure."

The Secretary reported that the Commission had advised regarding similar legislation, which was introduced in the 82d Congress last year. Dr. Wilson was a prominent civic leader of the colored race. Last year the Commission suggested a fountain, for a site at the intersection of Vermont Avenue and Eleventh Street, N. W.

The Commission reaffirmed the action taken at a meeting held on July 2, 1952, stating that "In the event of the enactment of the legislation by the Congress, the Commission will give careful consideration to the type and design of the proposed Memorial." A Report was sent to Senator Jenner accordingly (Exhibit H).

14. MEMORIAL TO MRS. SARA LOUISA RITTENHOUSE: Under date of February 6, 1953, the Commission received the following letter from Honorable William E. Jenner, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Enclosed please find two copies of S. J. Res. 37, introduced by Senator Clements, of Kentucky, to authorize the erection of a Memorial to Sara Louisa Rittenhouse in Montrose Park, District of Columbia.

"I would appreciate your comments as to the advisability of this measure."

S. J. Res. 37 provides that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant to the Georgetown Garden Club permission to erect in Montrose Park in the District of Columbia an appropriate Memorial to Sara Louisa Rittenhouse. The design of such Memorial shall, prior to the erection thereof, be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

"No part of any expense incurred in connection with the erection of such Memorial shall be borne by the United States."

Chairman Finley asked the Secretary for information concerning Miss Rittenhouse. The Secretary stated:

> "Miss Rittenhouse was a long-time resident of Georgetown, a civic leader, and much interested in promoting the Garden Club of Georgetown. She lived to be 98 years old, having been born in Georgetown in 1845.
>
> "Miss Rittenhouse was a leader in the movement to save Montrose Park from housing development somewhat over 40 years ago. It was largely through her efforts that Congress provided $110,000 for the purchase of Montrose Park comprising 16 acres; this was accomplished by the Act of March 2, 1911."

In this connection the Secretary called attention to a resolution adopted by the National Park Service Council, as follows:

> RESOLVED, That it is the sense of the Advisory Board that no consideration will be given to the National significance of the contribution performed by an individual for at least 25 years after the death of such person. Such a policy has been adopted to insure the proper historical perspective regarding the effect of such contribution upon our national heritage.

The Commission felt that this is a good precautionary measure. However, in the case of the Memorial to Miss Rittenhouse, it is to be simply a sun dial, to be given by her friends, and placed in Montrose Park. Mrs. Walter G. Peter, 1345 Thirtieth Street, Northwest, President of the National Society, Colonial Dames of America, who was a long time friend of Miss Rittenhouse, heads the movement to provide the needed funds for the Memorial.

The Commission felt that this is a good precautionary measure. However, in the case of the Memorial to Miss Rittenhouse, it is to be simply a sun dial, to be given by her friends, and placed in Montrose Park. Mrs. Walter G. Peter,

The Commission interposed no objection to the enactment of S. J. Res. 37, and Senator Jenner was informed accordingly. (Exhibit I).

15. SENATE BILL 1109: At the request of Senator H. Alexander Smith, Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, the Commission considered Senate Bill 1109, "A Bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission and for other purposes."

The Commission noted that the Bill is similar to H. R. 452, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Howell. The Commission did not favor the enactment of the proposed Bill to establish the proposed National War Memorial Arts Commission. There is clear indication that to do so would create a conflict of duties between this new Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission decided to report to Senator Smith that they would prefer the enactment of H. R. 464, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House," which was introduced by Congressman Kearns on January 3, 1953; it provides for the erection and administration of an opera house by the Office of General Services Administration (Exhibit J).

Chairman Finley said with regard to Senate Bill 1109 (and H. R. 452), "I am afraid it might defeat the real purpose of getting the Opera House because the Bill provides for a very large appropriation, $1,000,000 the first year and many millions later, none of which would probably have possibility of passage at this Session, whereas the Kern Bill provides $25,000 for GSA to make a study of the situation and make a recommendation for a site and design of the building which would be submitted to us for approval."

Professor Hudnut said, "I think it is a mistake to have plans ~~prepared~~ prepared for a building when there is no prospect of the building being built. Those plans will become outmoded in five years at least." Professor Belluschi said that $25,000 is not sufficient to prepare a set of plans; it would prepare a program.

Chairman Finley said, "Under the Budget Rules, it is necessary to send the letter from Senator Smith to the Director of the Budget for approval by him first, because it involves expenditure of money for an opera house, etc."

16. OFFICE BUILDING, THIRTEENTH STREET AND PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NORTHWEST: Mr. Edwin Weihe, architect, submitted a set of revised blueprints for this building, in which he had made, as he said, "a slight revision of one drawing that was presented before." This was inspected by the architect members of the Commission and considered to be satisfactory. It had much to do with utility features as lighting, and air conditioning. He said "We have under-floor duct systems for the power and telephone distribution. A part of the mechanical equipment that would otherwise be over the top story, we have put on the second floor, which at the moment we believe is the least rentable, least desirable space; also we do not have to carry loads so far on columns."

On motion, properly moved and seconded, the design was approved. The Director of Inspection of the District Building was notified accordingly.

17. ART AND GOVERNMENT: Chairman Finley reported that, in order to make it possible to have the Report on Art and Government printed and sent to the President and to Members of Congress before the end of the present Session, it became necessary to send the copy to the Government Printing Office without further delay. It is to be made available in the month of May so as to allow Congress time to enact legislation for printing additional copies.

Mr. Finley said about two weeks ago he and Mr. Caemmerer were called upon to appear before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives regarding the appropriation item for the Commission of Fine Arts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, and that the sum of $26,400 has been requested, which will allow for two additional employes, or a total of four. He also said that the Committee had inquired as to when the Report on Art and Government would be available.

Chairman Finley said, "Under the Budget Rules, it is necessary to send the
[illegible] Director Smith to the Director of the Budget for approval by him
first, because it involves expenditure of money for an open-house, etc."

16. OFFICE BUILDING, THOMPSON'S POINT AND SHERBROOKE AVENUE, PORTLAND:
Mr. Edwin Weihe, architect, submitted a set of revised blueprints for this
building, in which he had made, as he said, "a slight revision of one drawing
that was presented before." This was inspected by the members of the
Committee and considered to be satisfactory. It had much to do with elimi-
nating an lighting, and air conditioning. He read the new urban-floor duct
systems for the power and telephone distribution. A part of the second and
adjacent [illegible] floor, which at the moment we believe is the least rentable, least desirable
space; also we do not have to carry loads so far on columns."

On motion, properly moved and seconded, the design was approved. The
Director of Inspection of the District Building was notified accordingly.

17. ART AND GOVERNMENT: Chairman Finley reported that, in order to make
it possible to have the Report on Art and Government printed and sent to the
President and to Members of Congress before the end of the present Session, it
became necessary to send the copy to the Government Printing Office without
further delay. It is to be made available in the month of May so as to allow
Congress time to enact legislation for printing additional copies.

Mr. Finley said about two weeks ago he and Mr. Cammerer were called upon
to appear before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives
regarding the appropriation item for the Commission of Fine Arts for the fiscal
year beginning July 1, 1923, and that the sum of $26,400 has been requested,
which will allow for two additional employes, or a total of four. He also said
that the Committee had inquired as to when the Report on Art and Government
would be available.

Mr. Biddle said he felt very much disappointed that the Report has gone to the Public Printer, since he had hoped the Report could be given a final review at this meeting of the Commission. He thereupon requested that he be allowed to file a supplemental report, in which he intended to express his personal views on the subject, in particular with regard to having three additional members of the staff on a salary basis.

After discussion, the Commission agreed that Mr. Biddle should file a supplementary statement as he desires.

The Commission devoted the afternoon, in session in the Trustees Board Room at the National Gallery of Art to a review of the chapter on "Recommendations," and made a few changes in matters of detail.

18. THE COMMISSION DECIDED TO HOLD THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS IN WASHINGTON ON MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1953.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Biddle said he felt very much disappointed that the Report has gone to
e Public Printer, since he had hoped the Report could be given a final read
t this meeting of the Commission. He thereupon requested that he be allowed
o file a supplemental report, in which he intended to express his personal views
n the subject, in particular with regard to having three additional members of
he staff on a salary basis.

After discussion, the Commission agreed that Mr. Biddle should file a sup-
lementary statement as he desires.

The Commission devoted the afternoon, in session in the Trustees Board Room
t the National Gallery of Art to a review of the chapter on "Recommendations,"
nd made a few changes in matters of detail.

18. THE COMMISSION DECIDED TO HOLD THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF
INE ARTS IN WASHINGTON ON MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1959.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1980

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 22, 1953

Mr. BROYHILL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Virginia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (referred to hereinafter as "the Commissioners") are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a four-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Virginia, across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches and roads connecting such bridge and approaches with streets, park roads, and highways in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

EXHIBIT A

(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder structure with a swing span having a one hundred and fifty-foot horizontal clearance on each side of the pivot pier and a seventy-foot vertical clearance above mean low water, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (33 U. S. C., secs. 491–498), and subject to the conditions and limitations in this Act.

(c) The Commissioners shall request recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads.

SEC. 2 (a) The Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over lands at or near the site of the bridge shall transfer to the Commissioners, upon their request, any such lands to be occupied by the bridge, approaches or connecting roads, all as more particularly described in plans of such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads to be approved by the Commissioners, the Commissioner of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland.

(b) The Commissioners may acquire by purchase or by condemnation any and all lands, not under Federal juris-

diction or control, in the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland needed for such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, title to such land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States. In case a price satisfactory to the Commissioners cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of such land or in case the title cannot be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure such land by condemnation, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or condemnation, or both, shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this Act. Jurisdiction and control over any land acquired under the authority of this Act shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioners may make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at or adjacent to the site of the bridge as may be necessary for making borings, performing other preliminary work, routing and rerouting traffic, constructing such bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, and storing materials incident to such preliminary work and to actual construction.

(b) The Commissioners may route and reroute and cause the routing and rerouting of traffic on, and close or cause to be closed, streets, roads, and highways under the jurisdiction of the United States, and negotiate for the closing of streets, roads, and highways by contact with Virginia

and Maryland authorities, when necessary in connection with the preparation of plans for, and during the actual construction of, the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads.

SEC. 4. The cost of construction, reconstruction, and repair of all roads which are changed or made necessary as an incident to the construction of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, when approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland, shall be paid out of funds made available for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) If requested by the Commissioners, the National Park Service shall remove any planting materials and recreational facilities within the area or areas to be used for the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads or for construction purposes. The Commissioners may regrade the areas involved so as to conform with plans to be approved by them, the Commissioner of Public Roads, the Department of Highways, State of Virginia, and the State Roads Commission of the State of Maryland.

(b) Upon completion of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads and the regrading of the areas, or prior thereto, when authorized by the Commissioners, and when such operation or operations will not interfere with the con-

struction of the bridge, approaches, and connecting roads, the National Park Service shall landscape such areas in accordance with the plans of the National Park Service approved by the Commissioners and by the Commissioner of Public Roads. The cost of such landscaping shall be paid out of funds made available for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1980

A BILL

To authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Virginia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BROYHILL

JANUARY 22, 1953
Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING REGULATIONS

March 10, 1953

The Secretary reported: I am to appear at the Zoning Commission meeting by your direction, Mr. Finley, tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock. The Zoning Commission has up the question of amending the Zoning Regulations as follows:

February 9, 1953

In accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of an Act of Congress approved June 20, 1938 (Public No. 684, 75th Congress) entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of building and other structures, and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held in Room 500 of the District Building, beginning at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 11, 1953, for the purpose of considering proposed amendments to the Zoning Regulations, and amendments to the maps of the use, height, and area districts, the general summary of which reads as follows:

- -

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS

- -

Amend Paragraph 1, Section XIII to read:

"1. The provisions of the Act of June 1, 1910, as to spires, towers, domes, pinnacles, penthouses over elevator shafts, ventilation shafts, chimneys, smoke stacks, and fire-sprinkler tanks shall continue in full force and effect, except that on buildings hereafter erected the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall not approve the construction of fire-sprinkler tanks, water towers, or housing for air conditioning equipment <u>or elevator penthouses</u> to a height in excess of 130 feet measured from the level of the curb opposite the middle of the front of the building. Fire-sprinkler tanks, water towers, or housing for air conditioning equipment may be erected or enlarged on buildings existing prior to December 1, 1944 as provided under Section XXIII of these regulations."

<u>New Wording Underscored</u>

Amend Paragraph 11, Section XIII to read:

"11. In the 110-foot height district buildings may be erected to a height not exceeding 130 feet, provided such buildings face or abut a street or streets not less than 110-feet wide between building lines, and provided, that above the 110-foot level all exterior walls on the street and alley sides and on the sides of the lot abutting a lower height district are set back 6 inches for each foot of height above this level; and provided further, that on buildings hereafter erected fire sprinkler tanks, water towers, housing

EXHIBIT B

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING REGULATIONS

March 10, 1959

The Secretary reported: I am to appear at the Zoning Commission meeting
your direction, Mr. Finley, tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock. The Zoning Commis-
ion has up the question of amending the Zoning Regulations as follows:

February 9, 1951

In accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of an Act of Congress approved June 20, 1938 (Public No. 685, 75th Congress) entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of building and other structures, and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held in Room 500 of the District Building, beginning at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 11, 1959, for the purpose of considering proposed amendments to the Zoning Regulations, and amendments to the maps of the use, height, and area districts, the general boundary of which reads as follows:

- -

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS

- -

Amend Paragraph 1, Section XIII to read:

"1. The provisions of the Act of June 1, 1910, as to explosives, fumes, dense, pungent, or offensive vapors, smoke, ashes, ventilation shafts, chimneys, smoke stacks, and fire-sprinkler tanks shall continue in full force and effect, except that on buildings hereafter erected the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall not approve the construction of fire-sprinkler tanks, water towers, or housing for air conditioning equipment or elevator penthouses to a height in excess of 130 feet measured from the level of the main curb in the middle of the front of the building. Fire-sprinkler tanks, water towers, or housing for air conditioning equipment may be erected or enlarged on buildings existing prior to December 1, 1944 as provided under Section XXIII of these regulations."

New Wording Underscored

Amend Paragraph 11, Section XIII to read:

"11. In the 110-foot height district buildings may be erected to a height not exceeding 130 feet, provided such building face or abut a street or streets not less than 110-feet wide between building lines, and provided, that above the 110-foot level all exterior walls on the street and alley sides and on the sides of the lot abutting a lower height district are set back 6 inches for each foot of height hereafter erected fire sprinkler tanks, water towers, housing above this level; and provided further, that on buildings

for air conditioning equipment and elevator penthouses shall not exceed a height of 130 feet measured from the level of the curb opposite the middle of the front of the building. On construction existing prior to December 1, 1944, the Commissioners and the Board of Zoning Adjustment may approve the erection or enlargement of fire sprinkler tanks, water towers, and housing for air conditioning equipment as provided in Section XXIII of these regulations. The set-back of the exterior walls of a building located along the alley sides and on the sides of the lot abutting a lower height district as provided by this paragraph shall not be required for any portion of a building removed 10 feet or more from the required rear yard or from the line of the lot abutting the lower height district. Where a rear yard is not required, a set-back shall only be provided within the 10 feet of the lot abutting the rear lot line."

MR. CAEMMERER: Now several architects here in Washington want to put pent houses above the 130-foot height and it is quite a controversy.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Above the 130 feet?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes, to allow pent houses and other things.

MR. PEETS: For elevators and the like.

MR. CAEMMERER: They say otherwise they cannot get elevators above the 12th story--that is for people in the 13th and 14th. Mr. Clas, you will find, he is strong for allowing pent houses over the 130-foot limit. The Director of the National Park Service, Conrad Wirth, who is a member of the Zoning Commission, will oppose it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Why does it come to this Commission? Is it necessary that this Commission make a decision of that kind?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are asked for an opinion as to whether the Zoning Commission should grant it.

MR. CAEMMERER: It involves the Shipstead-Luce Act.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What is the present height, 110 feet?

MR. CAEMMERER: Along the street. They can build up to 110 feet, in one facade, in a straight line from the curb of the street. But above 110 feet, they have to have setbacks.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is that a custom that has been established?

for air conditioning equipment and elevator penthouses shall not exceed a height of 130 feet measured from the level of the curb opposite the middle of the front of the building. On construction existing prior to December 1, 1944, the Commissioner may approve the erection or enlargement of fire sprinkler tanks, water towers, and housing for air conditioning equipment as provided in Section XXIII of these regulations. The set-back of the exterior walls of a building located along the alley sides and on the sides of the lot abutting a lower height district as provided by this paragraph shall not be required for any portion of a building removed 10 feet or more from the required rear yard or from the line of the lot abutting the lower height district. Where a rear yard is not required, a set-back shall only be provided within the 10 feet of the lot abutting the rear lot line."

MR. CAMMERMEYER: Five several architects here in Washington would be put pass those above the 130-foot height and it is quite a controversy.

MR. SHILLINGFLEET: Above the 130 feet?

MR. CAMMERMEYER: Yes, to allow penthouses and other things.

MR. PEETS: For elevators and the like.

MR. CAMMERMEYER: They say otherwise they cannot get elevators above the 8th story--that is for people in the 13th and 14th. Mr. Cook, you will find it is wrong for allowing pent houses over the 130-foot limit. The Director of the National Park Service, Conrad Wirth, who is a member of the Zoning Commission, will oppose it.

MR. SHILLINGFLEET: Why does it come to this Commission? Is it necessary that this Commission make a decision of that kind?

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: We are asked for an opinion as to whether the Zoning Commission should grant it.

MR. CAMMERMEYER: It involves the Shipstead-Luce Act.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: What is the present height, 110 feet?

MR. CAMMERMEYER: Along the street. They can build up to 110 feet, in one case, in a straight line from the curb of the street. But above 110 feet, they have to have setbacks.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: Is that a custom that has been established?

MR. CAEMMERER: For many years.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Not a zoning regulation?

MR. CAEMMERER: By law of Congress really.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What law?

MR. PEETS: The innovation was made last fall or sometime by the Commissioners to permit the builder to put in as many stories as he wanted to within the height limit expressed in feet. Previously there had been a limit on the number of feet and on the number of stories, based on an old fashioned story height of 15 feet, or whatever it might be, so that they never got to the height limit under their number of stories. So the businessmen asked for an increase in the height, expressed in feet, and the Commissioners turned them down on that but permitted them in commercial offices only, not in apartment houses, to build up to the height regardless of the number of stories. And now comes a proposal to require that all the construction for elevator penthouses must be below the height limit in feet. That really robs them of those two stories that they gained by the other action.

MR. CAEMMERER: Mr. Peets, there is one proviso on that. According to the building regulations the architect must provide for an eight-foot ceiling.

MR. PEETS: Yes.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I can see seven-foot stories.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They must have eight-foot ceilings. Would this make these buildings of 130 feet with penthouses seem to conflict with the height of the Capitol Dome. That is the controlling feature, isn't it?

MR. PEETS: The important factor is the general height of buildings through the city. Washington, like Boston, used to be a low-rise city. When you see the city from any distant high point that is very obvious, in great contrast to all other American cities with their skyscrapers shooting up. Of course the developers have been biting away at it and trying to get more and more.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They will never be satisfied. Given that, they will come back, since the thing is up that high, can we raise the other, so little by little, it will eat through.

MR. PEETS: In the meantime, traffic congestion increases, and new buildings are going on parking lots. The new building at Pennsylvania and 13th is built on a parking lot, so it eliminates the parking lot and adds so many hundred cars to the number that will be seeking places in that general neighborhood. Conrad Wirth is against it for those reasons, primarily on account of the congestion of cars and general population rather than from any esthetic factor. But I have felt that, frankly, it is a question of what the Commissioners did last summer when they made that change. If they intended that pent houses should be above the 130-foot height that they established, then they should not change it now because these people have made their plans, they are ready to go to building on the other assumption.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I feel that our jurisdiction in that is not a good one. I would rather see good looking buildings with pent houses going above rather than ugly ones below that height. There is no magic so far as attractiveness or even approving one way or the other, taking one stand or another. It seems to me that it goes only from the point of view of taking a stand and maintaining it over a long period would be foolish to keep on allowing more and more until finally it is defeated.

MR. PEETS: I think there is an actual esthetic factor in the general height of the buildings. You appreciate it particularly from the Little Tea House out on Arlington Ridge Road where you get a wonderful view over the city. There is another place in the Arlington Cemetery, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, there is a terrace from which you get that view. The minute you walk out and get that view, the low buildings, it is astonishing, it is a large city with uniform height for the buildings. That comes from being exceptionally low and I think that should be maintained esthetically but I have been skeptical about our having

MR. BELLUSCHI: They will never be satisfied. Given that, they will come back, since the thing is up that high, can we raise one other, so little by little, it will get through.

MR. PEETE: In the meantime, traffic congestion increases, and new buildings are going on parking lots. The new building at Pennsylvania and 12th is built on a parking lot, so it eliminates the parking lot and adds to many hundred cars to the number that will be seeking places in that general neighborhood. Coupled with a superior IA for those reasons, primarily on account of the congestion of cars and general population rather than from any esthetic factor. Then I have felt that, really, it is a question of what the Commissioners did last summer when they made that change. It they intended that part because should be above the 130-foot height and they established, then they should not change it now because those people have made their plans, they are ready to go to building on the other assumption.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I feel that our jurisdiction in that is not a good one. I would rather see good looking buildings with good bones going many stories higher than only ones below that height. There is no magic so far as attractiveness or even improving one way or the other, taking one record or another. It seems to me that it goes only from the point of view of taking a stand and maintaining it over a long period would be foolish to keep on allowing more and more until finally it is defeated.

MR. PEETE: I think there is an actual esthetic factor in the general height of the buildings. You appreciate it particularly from the Little Tea House out on Arlington Ridge Road where you get a wonderful view over the city. There is another place in the Arlington Cemetery, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, there is a terrace from which you get that view. The minute you walk out and get that view, the low buildings, it is enormous, it is a large city with ordinary height for the buildings. That comes from being exceptionally low and I think that should be maintained esthetically but I have been skeptical about our having

anything to do with it. Where do we come in? We would have to start with a disclaimer and say that we don't know anything, have no responsibility in connection with the legal aspect of the situation, whether it is justifiable to change the rules after these people have started their plans. That is something that we know nothing about. The best we could say would be in a general sense. We feel Washington should be maintained as a city of low construction and that is better for practical reasons and better for esthetic reasons which are especially important to us. I do not know that we could go beyond that. It would be only as a very general opinion of favoring anything which legally and advisedly could be done to keep the buildings low.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think that that seems to be a very sensible stand. Really we have no jurisdiction, other than to cite the law that low buildings should not be little by little eroded by concessions that will keep on coming, I am sure.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is a sound position to take, but I do remember I have always been brought up on the idea that the Capitol Dome and the Washington Monument should dominate the skyline and that no building should compete with the Capitol and the Washington Monument.

MR. PEETS: That is very true in the area on Capitol Hill and of all places, of all buildings, that principle was forgotten when they built the annex to the Library of Congress. Actually, in that view from the Little Tea House, the Library annex stands up above the old Library and definitely competes with the Capitol.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And the Library of Congress Dome does also.

MR. PEETS: I am sure that the Library annex is two or three stories higher than it should be, from that principle.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think what makes Rome so beautiful in the distance is that you see the domes with nothing to compete.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The architect was given a prize for the Hancock building.

MR. CAEMMERER: Will you suggest that as a resolution, it is the opinion of the Commission that in general —

MR. NEILD: Have we been asked for an expression? It is a vital matter that will involve cases coming before the Commission under the Shipstead-Luce Act?

MR. PEETS: That has come under it. We reviewed that plan and approved that plan for the building on 13th and Pennsylvania.

MR. CAEMMERER: That is quite true, but here is now a special hearing on this matter, a question of adopting the policy principle. It would seem to me that if the Commission would go on record as Mr. Peets said, in a general sense, Washington should be maintained as a city of low buildings, low construction for esthetic reasons.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Let us say we have no facts on which to base an opinion as to the legal aspects of the present situation.

MR. CAEMMERER: If I am to appear tomorrow at the hearing, I will be asked that question. They know the Commission meets today and while there will be a number of architects who will favor a proposal to build penthouses over 130 feet, there are also, I know, a number who will oppose it. On the Zoning Commission there is no unity of sentiment on the subject.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is not the question at issue the interpretation of the ruling by the Zoning Commission last year, the revision of the height under the zoning law by which they are permitted to build to 130 feet.

MR. CAEMMERER: That is an old Zoning Regulation, conforming to the height of buildings, the Law of 1910.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I thought the old regulation permitted 110 feet.

MR. CAEMMERER: No, that is just the facade to the 110-foot height in the 110-foot area and beyond that, it involves setbacks. One can have even two setbacks. Now, before we get away from that point, I would like to show this

picture. This is a picture of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Building which Mr. Clas designed. It was built at Vermont Avenue and H Street, N. W. where the penthouse was built into the top attic, so to speak. It does not exceed 130 feet and it may be one way of treating that development.

MR. NEILD: Instead of a penthouse above, there is an attic story there in the center.

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes Sir, an attic story.

MR. NEILD: The penthouse is apparent there, isn't it?

MR. CAEMMERER: But it was built into the top setback. I think it would be very helpful if the Commission would say, endorse that principle.

MR. BIDDLE: What is the objection to endorsing?

MR. PEETS: A question of whether it is really relevant, whether we have a right.

MR. BIDDLE: We have a right to express an opinion always.

MR. PEETS: Yes, I know.

MR. BIDDLE: If we believe it.

MR. PEETS: But there is a certain question up before this meeting and whether that particular question comes within our scope is the question. I would think that it could be done with a strong disclaimer, it could be done and would probably please the Planning Commission. I don't think it would influence the action taken at all but it would at least reecho our general attitude and would —

MR. BELLUSCHI: You say what would not influence the decision?

MR. PEETS: I think that is going to be done on other than aesthetic grounds. It will be a question of determining the exact character of the action taken last year.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Then what you propose, it seems to me is on sound ground that we cannot pass on the legality of it.

MR. BIDDLE: Not at all.

MR. PEETS: I think that is going to be done on other than aesthetic grounds. It will be a question of determining the exact character of the action taken last year.

MR. ZEIMUSCHI: Then what you propose, it seems to me is on sound ground that we cannot pass on the legality of it.

MR. BIDDLE: Not at all.

MR. MEILD: Instead of penthouse above, there is an attic story there in the center.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes Sir, an attic story.

MR. MEILD: The penthouse is apparent there, isn't it?

MR. BIDDLE: But it was built into the top setback. I think it would very helpful if the Commission would say, endorse that principle.

MR. PEETS: A question of whether it is really relevant, whether we have a right.

MR. BIDDLE: We have a right to express an opinion always.

MR. PEETS: Yes, I know.

MR. BIDDLE: If we believe it.

MR. PEETS: But there is a certain question up before this meeting and whether that particular question comes within our scope in the question. I would think that it could be done with a strong dissolaimer. It could be done and would probably please the Planning Commission. I don't think it would influence the action taken at all but it would at least recoho our general attitude and would —

MR. ZEIMUSCHI: You say what would not influence the decision?

MR. PEETS: I think that is going to be done on other than aesthetic grounds. It will be a question of determining the exact character of the action taken last year.

MR. ZEIMUSCHI: Then what you propose, it seems to me is on sound ground that we cannot pass on the legality of it.

MR. BIDDLE: Not at all.

MR. BELLUSCHI: But here we are, really very firm in the opinion that the design should not be, the building should not be beyond and above a certain height.

MR. BIDDLE: Could I move that he phrase that in a few sentences, the feeling of the Commission on esthetic grounds.

MR. CAEMMERER: It would be very helpful.

MR. PEETS: Mr. Chairman, if I may do that sometime during the day, I will write a brief resolution that Mr. Caemmerer can read that will set forth our position.

MR. CAEMMERER: It will help me very much.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you will do that Mr. Peets, we will appreciate it.

In compliance with this request, Mr. Peets wrote the following resolution:

> "The Commission of Fine Arts is not concerned with the legal, financial or technical aspects of building height limitations. We are concerned only with the aesthetic factor--and in Washington that is a very important one. We believe that Washington is fortunate in being a relatively low construction city. Low construction adds to the city's order and dignity, gives us plenty of light and air, makes an appropriate setting for the monumental buildings and helps to attract visitors.
>
> In our opinion the present legal height limitations in the Central Area have reached--and perhaps exceeded--the aesthetically desirable limits. We believe that Washington gains aesthetically by every decision that maintains the low construction character of the city."

(The above Resolution was read by Mr. Caemmerer at the meeting of the Zoning Commission on March 11, 1953)

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 6, 1953

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts has received a letter from Major General U. S. Grant, 3rd, Retired, Chairman of the Joint Committee for the National Capital, protesting against the materials being used in the erection of a building for a Veterans Hospital on the Fort Belvoir Reservation in Virginia. The hospital, which is to be a large one, containing 500 beds, is to be faced with concrete blocks and is to be located near the main entrance road at Fort Belvoir.

About twenty-five years ago the Commission of Fine Arts was requested by the War Department to advise in the matter of design for a group of new buildings to be erected at Fort Belvoir, then known as Fort Humphreys. The Commission recommended a type of brick building, which was adopted by the War Department for this group of buildings and has been adhered to until now. As a result, the Reservation has been harmoniously developed and presents a distinctive and impressive appearance. These buildings are in close proximity to Mount Vernon and also to Woodlawn Plantation, which is one of the important historic houses in this country and is administered by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

If a large hospital, faced with concrete blocks, is erected as part of the group of buildings now at Fort Belvoir, the result, from an aesthetic point of view, would be unfortunate. While the Commission realizes the necessity for economy at this time, we would regret to see a building erected which would remain for many years and would create a precedent for other buildings of a similar type which might be erected in the future.

The Commission hope that you may find it possible to direct that the proposed hospital shall be faced with brick, rather than concrete blocks, and made to conform to the type of building now in existence at Fort Belvoir.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Charles E. Wilson,
Secretary of Defense
Pentagon Building
Washington 25, D. C.

DEF/amv

cc: Mr. Caemmerer

EXHIBIT C

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 6, 1953

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts has received a letter from Major General U. S. Grant, 3rd, Retired, Chairman of the Public Committee for the National Capital, protesting against the materials being used in the erection of a building for a Veterans Hospital on the Fort Belvoir Reservation in Virginia. The hospital, which is to be a large one, containing 700 beds, is to be faced with concrete blocks and is to be located near the main entrance road at Fort Belvoir.

About twenty-five years ago the Commission of Fine Arts was requested by the War Department to advise in the matter of design for a group of new buildings to be erected at Fort Belvoir, then known as Fort Humphreys. The Commission recommended a type of brick building, which was accepted by the War Department for this group of buildings and has been adhered to until now. As a result, the Reservation has been harmoniously developed and presents a distinctive and impressive appearance. These buildings are in close proximity to Mount Vernon and also to Woodlawn Plantation, which is one of the important historic houses in this country and is administered by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

If a large hospital, faced with concrete blocks, is erected as part of the group of buildings now at Fort Belvoir, the result, from an aesthetic point of view, would be unfortunate. While the Commission realizes the necessity for economy at this time, we would regret to see a building erected which would remain for many years and would create a precedent for other buildings of a similar type which might be erected in the future.

The Commission hope that you may find it possible to direct that the proposed hospital shall be faced with brick, rather than concrete blocks, and made to conform to the type of building now in existence at Fort Belvoir.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Gerald E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Charles E. Wilson,
Secretary of Defense
Pentagon Building
Washington 25, D. C.

DEF\amv

cc: Mr. Cammerer

COPY

March 10, 1953

DISCUSSION REGARDING DESIGN FOR LITTLE FALLS PUMPING STATION

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to make a statement?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Yes, if I may. Gentlemen, we wish to submit to you today the design studies for the pumping station at the Dalecarlia Filter Plant which is a part of the expansion program of the water supply system for metropolitan Washington. About thirty years ago, the Fine Arts Commission approved the architectural treatment of the present buildings at the Dalecarlia Plant. We have with us some representative pictures of these buildings so that you may see the pattern into which we have attempted to fit the new proposed structure. I will first call on Mr. E. A. Schmitt to outline to you the engineering considerations that have led us to the location and the general form of the structure. The treatment here is somewhat unique in that the major part of the structure is underground. I will then ask Mr. George G. Worth to outline to you the architectural and the landscaping features of the structure. First, Mr. Schmitt.

MR. SCHMITT: We have an expansion program on the water supply system which in the Washington acqueduct, our division will run some $40 or $42 million. Part of that was the construction of a pumping station and this will show the general layout of the Dalecarlia area. The dark brown areas are structures now existing. In connection with that we have to have additional filter plant here, additional base up here and this one existing, so that the pumping stations are close to filter plant are very desirable feature, also existing reservoir which surrounds this area here was entirely too small to carry the capacity needed for success for this new pumping station which uses 450 million gallons per day, capacity, so we were fortunate in having a big hollow in this area. So we located a 30 million gallon clear well in this area and as you can see close to the pumping station, being very desirable, we put the pumping station down in the hole. That has an

March 10, 1953

DISCUSSION REGARDING DESIGN FOR FILTER PLANT MEMBERS STATION

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to make a statement?

COUNCIL MEMBER: Yes, if I may. Gentlemen, we wish to submit to you today the design studies for the pumping station at the Delaverde filter plant which is a part of the expansion program of the water supply system for metropolitan Washington. About thirty years ago, the Pine Tree Commission approved the architectural treatment of the present building at the Delaverde Plant. We have with us some representative pictures of these buildings so that you may see the pattern into which we have attempted to fit the new proposed structure. With these call on Mr. A. Conkle to outline to you the engineering considerations that have led up to the location and the general lay-out of the structure. We treatment here is somewhat unique in that the major part of the structure is underground. I will then ask Mr. George O. Worth to outline to you the proposed and the landscaping features of the structure. Thank, Mr. Conkle.

MR. CONKLE: We have an expansion program on the water supply system which in the Washington metropolitan, our division will run more $40 or $50 million. Part of that was the construction of a pumping station and this will serve the general layout of the Delaverde area. The dark brown areas are structures now existing. In connection with that we have to have additional filter plant here, additional lines up here and this one existing, so that the pumping stations may close to filter plant are very desirable feature, also existing reservoir which structure this area here was entirely too small to carry the capacity needed for success for this new pumping station which runs 450 million gallons per day, capacity, we were fortunate to having a big hollow in this area. So we located a 30 million gallon clear well in this area and as you can see close to the pumping station, built very desirable, we put the pumping station down in the hole. That was an

engineering advantage of what we call head on the pump. We never need any priming apparatus or anything else. There is always 15 feet of water above the level of the center of the pump, which not only simplifies the operation but improves the operation. As a consequence, the pumping station was put in this area here, roughly, about 100 by 200 feet in dimension. But every bit of the pumping station physically is below the ground level. That is illustrated by these two drawings here. By the way, this is the filter plant that was approved back in 1923 or '24. You remember that, Mr. Caemmerer. These are just some representative pictures to show the design. This is the office and the laboratory and this is the chemical tower and this is the place where we make alum. This is the filter building which extends back of that building, and this is the present pumping station which is being superseded as being absolutely too small to serve our future needs. This is the pumping station wing, that is the chemical tower and that is the entrance to the building.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Where do they show in the plans, where is that shown on the plans?

MR. SMITH. This is the tower looking at it this way, that is the pumping plant and this is the laboratories and offices in here. All of this is the filter plant. So that we were presented with quite an engineering problem of getting everything through there. There were any number of utilities down in that hole that all had to be taken care of such as conduits. You have no idea of the complexity of things that are in there. We have the raw water conduit that comes through here. We have the filtered water going into this 30 million gallon reservoir. We have two effluents to run into the pumping station. We have a major drain that drains from the lake through here and goes out. We have a big pipeline, 60-inch here. We have four pipelines coming up this way, another pipeline which goes across the reservoir out there. So it was quite a problem to make all the arrangements and get everything hooked up underground where it was

engineering advantage of what we call head on the pump. We never need any kind of pumping apparatus or anything else. There is always 15 feet of water above the level of the center of the pump, which not only simplifies the operation but improves the operation. As a consequence, the pumping station was put in this area here, roughly, about 100 by 200 feet in dimension. But every bit of the pumping station physically is below the ground level. That is illustrated by these two drawings here. By the way, this is the filter plant that was approved back in 1925 or '26. You remember that, Mr. Chairman. These are just some reference drawings here. By the way, this is the filter plant that was approved back in 1925 or '26. You remember that, Mr. Chairman. These are just some representative pictures to show the design. This is the office and the laboratory and this is the chemical tower and this is the place where we make alum. This is the filter building which extends back of that building, and this is the present pumping station which is being superseded as being absolutely too small to serve our future needs. This is the pumping station wing, that is the chemical tower and that is the entrance to the building.

MR. BECKINGHAM: Where do they show in the plans, where it just shows on the plans?

MR. SMITH. This is the tower looking at it this way, that is the pumping plant and this is the laboratories and offices in here. All of this is the filter plant. So that we were presented with quite an engineering problem of getting everything through there. There were any number of difficulties over in that little that all had to be taken care of much as conduits. You have no idea of the complexity of things that are in there. We have the raw water conduit that comes through here. We have the filtered water going into this 30 million gallon reservoir. We have two effluents to run into the pumping station. We have a major drain that drains from the lake through here and goes out. We have a big pipeline, 60-inch here. We have four pipelines coming up this way, another pipeline which goes across the reservoir out there. So it was quite a problem to make all the arrangements and get everything hooked up underground where to was

most desirable. The drawing that we have prepared of this particular station at the present time is shown here. This is ground level up here. This is down some 50 or 60 feet. Suction conduit, suction tube, these are all pumps, about 15 pumps in there running up to about 2500 horsepower motor for the larger size. This is a cross-section of the building. Again this is the ground line, raw water ducts, pipelines coming out, conduits going in and so on, so that the basic building is all below ground level. The next problem was how to get into that building. So we designed a penthouse, we called this, through which there is a big open well as shown here. Trucks will come through here, will pick up the load, drop it down to this, the crane will drop it down to that floor, that crane will move it up and down the building. The rest of the design we had was functional. We needed transformers. We get current in at 13,000 volts and we have to put it down to 4160 which is operating current for moter. That is three transformers there. On this side we have to have 2400 volt current to operate facilities now existing on the reservation. So this is the transformer and this is the transformer and switch gear. Another problem, being underground, was ventilation. So we have provided in here, this place and this one here, space for air conditioning equipment, fans and blowers and so forth. The next problem was the actual fire escape means from the building, so we have a stairway here, and 200 feet away this other stairway. The service stairway from the building is here and passenger elevator there, freight elevator there and there is duct space to bring electric cables, pumping fixtures, air conditioning ducts and so on up throught the various levels of the building. The pump room is all open from here to here, but here we have two or three stories in here so this will be storage, air conditioning equipment and machine shop. In here will be a control room facing the center of the building as shown right here. And up here will be some offices. There will be a switch gear here. All the back part of that is occupied by switch gear and all that is occupied by switch gear. So the underground building is very thoroughly

and completely utilized for all the various types of equipment that we have to have. It only lacks the access space up above to get in. So far as we see it, this is absolutely functional. This is covered well here and we expect that visitors will come in and we expect that we have 5000 more visitors a year to whom we want to give a little accommodations. This well is surrounded with a railing, with glass panels in it to prevent anybody falling through and the railing is carried up about 36 to 38 inches high to prevent children from having any chance of falling in. So everything is strictly functional. These are switch gear, the service requirements, the fire escape stairway and entrance into the pump room. If there are any other questions on that, I will be glad to answer them. I have done it in a hurry but I think it covers the principal features.

Mr. Worth, take over.

MR. WORTH: The appearance of that pumping station or that super structure will give us an elevation something like this. We try to conform with the existing pumping station treatment and using the same kind of enclosure around the entrance foyer and electrical equipment there which is sort of a garden wall around the whole thing to obscure or mask it. The rear, of course, will be open but we have a picket, wrought iron picket fence there to make it absolutely secure. And the approach to that, I think I can show that better on here — this will become the main entrance to the whole plant and we figure on emphasizing that somewhat with brick piers and also wrought iron fence treatment which we will extend across the whole plant eventually. This would be the entrance, then, and we are going around this wrought iron fence here and this would be the exit then. We are going to use the surplus material that came out of this excavation to fill in this area here. We want to terrace that somewhat, run around and around here and utilize this for parking areas. This triangle in here we want to try to plant an azalea garden there and this portion here, hedge it with multi-floral rose hedge which is very dense sort of a hedge rather than have just an ordinary

security fence there. The intake here is surrounded by cherry trees and they are in bloom right now. It makes a very attractive setting. We tried to indicate that here somewhat. That is about the way they are. We want to preserve that and emphasize it, leave the road around the island there. These trees are in there now. We want to extend that planting out in this direction somewhat and probably ease up this road a little more. That goes across the entire plant like this, and utilize this for additional parking area. This old pumping station we had in mind we will use that for sort of reception center for the public or lecture hall. That really forms the center part of the whole group. That photograph in the center there shows the entrance at the moment. We used the same thing on the McMillan Reservation and we figured on carrying out the same scheme right here. The old pumping station is this picture in the corner here. That is looking at it from the tower. The new one will set right here; so the architectural part of it conforms with what the old pump station has to get to it.

MR. SCHMITT: One of the keynotes of the building, why it was approved, these circular openings they have everywhere in the building, in front of the office, up there in the tower and entrance of the chemical building and that keynote has been carried over into our design. As I say, the thing is very functional so that we tried to limit it only to what we had. It should match. It should conform to the existing structure out there so we are putting up in brick with the same kind of bonds and we are carrying out the roof with the same gables and cornice and so on, and on the side we used the windows you see here in the buildings. And in here, so everything that we have put into that particular design is our endeavor to make the new structure form a part of the unit of the old structure. That is the thing we believe we have accomplished.

MR. WORTH: It also permits us to clean up the whole front part of the plant in pretty good shape. This portion here is pretty much up in the air yet. There are a lot of things that have to be done in there. We planned on putting the new

chemical building right in here. Then we plan on putting additional filters right next to the old ones. So this portion here is going to be more or less, and will be for a good many years to come. But nevertheless, we can clean up this part of it in pretty good shape, treat it in landscaping and so on.

MR. SCHMITT: We present this picture or rendering for consideration and possible direction so we can go ahead with other elements of plans and specifications and finally, advertising contracts.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: A very good presentation. Are there any questions?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Is this the same rendering presented for the bridge?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Mr. Worth, unfortunately, was sick that day and could not attend. He prepared that one also.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You repeated several times it was a functional design, which we all agree it is. And also with the exception that the buildings look like little churches or little meeting buildings, it seems to quite fit, but I think it is very logical to keep in the same spirit as the original buildings.

MR. SCHMITT: Some of that was dictated. When you have a crane and a hook to hoist loads you need a vertical height.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am not questioning that.

MR. SCHMITT: That predicated the height of the building.

MR. PEETS: Those could be big carriage houses or stables in Georgian architecture. Is it possible to have more trees there?

MR. WORTH: The trees you see there are cherry trees. They are about 25 years old now and I do not know whether we can add any more to that. I think there are one or two on the other side of that intake structure but I do not believe that we could plant any more in there now.

MR. SCHMITT: I will agree with you it looks very bare and we intend to do a very thorough landscaping when the structure has been completed. We will be engaged for the next five to ten years constructing various elements around this

area and even some of this fill around here may not be done for four or five years from now. So when that finally gets completed, we will do a thorough landscaping job.

MR. PEETS: Just that fill is a fine start with trees because they all do better on fill than cut. One point I would like to bring up for comment. The brick entrances to the roof, I might toss out the suggestion that it might look better if you had at each side of the entrance a single string brick pier and have the iron fence end at it.

MR. SCHMITT: We could do that all right. This was just our first suggestion of what to do.

MR. WORTH: I want to show this gentleman the one we did build at McMillan. I do not believe he can see it very well from where he is sitting.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: This is the present entrance to the office which Mr. Worth designed.

MR. WORTH: That wrought iron railing we are talking about we have now on hand. It goes around the old basin and we have not any use for it any more and so we plan on utilizing that, as much of that as we can. The thought behind this was that we put it in the center, in this case the Washington District Office of the Corps of Engineers, and the McMillan Filtration Plant. A similar tablet would go on the new entrance to Dalecarlia and this forms a certain curve, you see, this corner pylon, like you mentioned, is really a dummy pylon, simply a stone pier with capping on top of it. The whole thing is circled and has planting bed in front of it and it is lighted at night. All along here we have curb lights so they are automatically controlled by photo-electric cells.

MR. PEETS: Are those practical?

MR. WORTH: The same thing as they use in highways but we put them right in the wall; that is, they throw light all the way across. In this particular case we have a guard right in the center of the entrance and in Dalecarlia I do not

believe we can do that; but that is the entrance we planned on, with a similar sort of background to it. I think this turned out right well. So that is what we plan on doing.

MR. PEETS: I still have the feeling that that construction does not seem to harmonize with the character of the institution. I will be glad to have our architects here make their comments.

MR. HUDNUT: Well, I think the character fits the existing buildings. You have a dilemma there. You either harmonize with the old buildings or have something entirely different.

MR. PEETS: I feel that the extreme simplicity of the buildings you have there — they are large openings — the civic character of them and is not in the same scale, not in the same expression as this more domestic estate character of those rather baroque entrance features.

MR. NEILD: I think the pattern is set by the old design and I think these new designs conform as well as you could expect.

MR. BIDDLE: I like it very much.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Any other questions?

MR. PEETS: I concede the point. I think it is going to look very nice.

MR. HUDNUT: I agree that they have chosen the right alternative, or the lesser evil, put it that way.

MR. NEILD: I move that it be approved.

MR. de WELDON: Second.

MR. PEETS: Second.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: All those in favor say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was then put to a vote and unanimously carried.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are very glad to approve it. A very good presentation.

plan on doing.

MR. PRETS: I still have the feeling that that construction does not seem to monize with the character of the institution. I will be glad to have our archi- ects here make their comments.

MR. HUDNUT: Well, I think the character fits the existing buildings. You ve a dilemma there. You either harmonize with the old buildings or have some- ing entirely different.

MR. PRETS: I feel that the extreme simplicity of the buildings you have here -- they are large openings -- the civic character of them and is not in the me scale, not in the same expression as this more domestic eatate character of ose rather baroque entrance features.

MR. NEILD: I think the pattern is set by the old design and I think these w designs conform as well as you could expect.

MR. BIDDLE: I like it very much.

MR. PRETS: I concede the point. I think it is going to look very nice.

MR. HUDNUT: I agree that they have chosen the right alternative, or the esser evil, put it that way.

MR. NEILD: I move that it be approved.

. de NEILD: Second.

. PRETS: Shown.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: All those in favor say aye; opposed, no.

(The motion was then put to a vote and unanimously carried.)

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: We are very glad to approve it. A very good presentation.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 11, 1953

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on March 10, 1953, the Commission considered the design which you submitted for the Dalecarlia Pumping Station.

The Commission approved the design.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Colonel Alan J. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
First and Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 11, 1953

Dear Colonel McCutcheon:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on March 10, 1953, the Commission considered the design which you submitted for the Delacarlia Pumping Station.

The Commission approved the design.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

Colonel Alan J. McCutcheon,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
First and Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

C O P Y

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

20 February 1953

Mr. David Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

I attach herewith a print of House Joint Resolution 157, introduced by Representative Devereux of Maryland.

The measure calls for an amendment to existing statutory authority which permits the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation to erect a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars. The present law inhibits the Foundation to a site within the District of Columbia on public land approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The enclosed resolution would extend the location authority to include public land in the immediate vicinity of the District. Before the Library subcommittee, of which I am chairman, can proceed to consideration of the amending resolution, I should like to have your views on the measure. Firstly, does the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines of the District; and, secondly (if the answer to the first question is in the affirmative), does the Commission have under advisement any area adjacent to the District which might fulfill the requirements contemplated originally by the Act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended?

Most of the members of the subcommittee, and of the full committee on House Administration, are familiar with the previous legislation on this subject, but I think they will not feel disposed to proceed to action on this joint resolution until a report is received from the Commission of Fine Arts.

Respectfully yours,

Sgd.
Robert D. Harrison

EXHIBIT F

20 February 1953

Mr. David Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

I attach herewith a print of House Joint Resolution 157, introduced by Representative Devereux of Maryland.

The measure calls for an amendment to existing statutory authority which permits the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation to erect a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars. The present law inhibits the Foundation to a site within the District of Columbia on public land approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The enclosed resolution would extend the location authority to include public land in the immediate vicinity of the District. Before the Library subcommittee, of which I am chairman, can proceed to consideration of the amending resolution, I should like to have your views on the measure. Firstly, does the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines of the District; and, secondly (if the answer to the first question is in the affirmative), does the Commission have under cognizance any area adjacent to the District which might fulfill the requirements contemplated originally by the Act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended?

to action on this joint resolution until a report is received from the Commission of Fine Arts.

83d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. J. RES. 157

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 29, 1953

Mr. Devereaux introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To amend the Act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act authorizing the erection of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead, approved July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242), as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "District of Columbia" the words "or immediate vicinity."

I

79th CONGRESS
1st Session

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 29, 1945

Mr. Devereaux introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To amend the Act of July 1, 1944 (61 Stat. 242), as amended.

1. Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives
2. of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
3. That the first section of the Act authorizing the erection of a
4. memorial to the Marine Corps dead, approved July 1, 1944
5. (61 Stat. 242), as amended, is amended by inserting after
6. the words "District of Columbia" the words "or immediate
7. vicinity."

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 16, 1953

Dear Congressman Harrison:

In further reference to your letter of February 20, concerning House Joint Resolution No. 157, I have to report, in behalf of The Commission of Fine Arts, that at a meeting held March 10, 1953, the Commission considered the following questions raised in your letter:

1. Does the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines of the District of Columbia? The answer is "Yes."

2. With regard to a location for the proposed Marine Memorial, The Commission of Fine Arts suggest placing the Memorial on a location now in Government ownership, such as, for instance, that adjacent to the north boundary of the Arlington National Cemetery. The Memorial should not be placed on the direct axis of the Mall and the Lincoln Memorial.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman

Hon. Robert D. Harrison
Committee on House Administration
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

DEF/amv

cc: Mr. Caemmerer, Sec., Comm. of Fine Arts

EXHIBIT G

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

March 16, 1953

Dear Congressman Harrison:

In further reference to your letter of February 20, concerning House Joint Resolution No. 157, I have to report, in behalf of The Commission of Fine Arts, that at a meeting held March 10, 1953, the Commission considered the following questions raised in your letter:

1. Does the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts go beyond the confines of the District of Columbia? The answer is "Yes."

2. With regard to a location for the proposed Marine Memorial, The Commission of Fine Arts suggest placing the Memorial on a location now in Government ownership, such as, for instance, that adjacent to the north boundary of the Arlington National Cemetery. The Memorial should not be placed on the direct axis of the Mall and the Lincoln Memorial.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

Gaylord E. Hinley,
Chairman

Hon. Robert D. Harrison
Committee on House Administration
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

DEF\amv

cc: Mr. Cammerer, Sec., Comm. of Fine Arts

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 12, 1953

Dear Senator Jenner:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 10, 1953, the Commission considered S. J. Res. 11, which you transmitted with your letter of January 30, requesting comments from the Commission of Fine Arts with regard to this legislation.

The Commission reaffirmed the action taken at a meeting held on July 2, 1952, with regard to this proposed memorial, which was as follows: "The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully report that in the event of the enactment of the legislation by the Congress, the Commission will give careful consideration to the type and design of the proposed memorial, and to plans for the treatment of the grounds."

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable William E. Jenner, Chairman,
Committee on Rules and Administration,
The United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT H

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 12, 1953

Dear Senator Jenner:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 10, 1953, I brought to the attention of the Commission your letter of February 6, in which you requested the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to S. J. Res. 37, "To authorize the erection of a memorial to Sara Louisa Rittenhouse in Montrose Park, District of Columbia."

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the Joint Resolution and approved it.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable William E. Jenner, Chairman,
Committee on Rules and Administration,
The United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT I

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 12, 1953

Dear Senator Jenner:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 10, 1953, I brought to the attention of the Commission your letter of February 6, in which you requested the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to S. 1. Res. 37, "To authorize the erection of a memorial to Sara Louisa Rittenhouse in Montrose Park, District of Columbia."

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the joint Resolution and approved it.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable William E. Jenner, Chairman,
Committee on Rules and Administration,
The United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 11, 1953

My dear Senator:

I have received your letter of March 2, with which you enclosed a copy of S. 1109, "A Bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission and for other purposes", for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts, and requesting a report on the bill. The Commission considered the bill at a meeting held on March 10 and has asked me to make the following report.

The Commission noted that the proposed legislation provides for the erection of an Opera House in the City of Washington as a National War Memorial. This the Commission heartily endorses, as a community music center in the City of Washington is very much needed. The Commission assumes that, if such a building is authorized, its construction must be accommodated within the fiscal and budgetary policies of the President and the Congress. If and when such a building is erected, the Commission feels that the administration of the building should be placed under the jurisdiction of an existing agency of the government, such as the Office of General Services Administration, rather than under a new Commission to be established for the purpose.

The Commission feels that the best interest of the arts in this country would not be promoted by the establishment of an Arts Commission, such as is contemplated in the bill. The Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910 for the purpose of providing expert advice to the President, the Congress, and government agencies on questions relating to the fine arts. If a new Commission, with jurisdiction over many of the Government's art activities, is established, as contemplated in the bill, there would probably arise a conflict of duties which should, if possible, be avoided.

The Commission of Fine Arts favors the enactment of H. R. 464, "To provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House, and for other purposes", which was introduced by Congressman Kearns on January 3, 1953, and provides for the erection and administration of an opera house by the Office of General Services Administration.

I should also add that, in recent months, the Commission has been in conference with representatives of departments and agencies of the government, as well as representatives of art organizations in the United States, on the subject of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of art. This survey has been made at the request of the President, who in January 1951 asked the Commission of Fine Arts to make such a survey and recommendations as to how these activities could be more effectively coordinated or further developed. The Commission has completed its report; and when it has been submitted to the President, I shall be glad to send you a copy, if you so desire, for your own use and that of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable H. Alexander Smith, Chairman
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
United States Senate, Washington D. C. DEF/amv

EXHIBIT J

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

March 11, 1953

y dear Senator:

I have received your letter of March 2, with which you enclosed a
opy of S. 1109, "A Bill to provide for the establishment of a National
r Memorial Arts Commission and for other purposes", for the consideration
f the Commission of Fine Arts, and requesting a report on the bill. The
ommission considered the bill at a meeting held on March 10 and has asked
e to make the following report.

The Commission noted that the proposed legislation provides for the
rection of an Opera House in the City of Washington as a National War
emorial. This the Commission heartily endorses, as a community music
enter in the City of Washington is very much needed. The Commission
ssumes that, if such a building is authorized, its construction must be
ccommodated within the fiscal and budgetary policies of the President and
he Congress. If and when such a building is erected, the Commission feels
hat the administration of the building should be placed under the juris-
iction of an existing agency of the government, such as the Office of
eneral Services Administration, rather than under a new Commission to be
stablished for the purpose.

The Commission feels that the best interest of the arts in this country
ould not be promoted by the establishment of an Arts Commission, such as is
ontemplated in the bill. The Commission of Fine Arts was established in
10 for the purpose of providing expert advice to the President, the Congress,
nd government agencies on questions relating to the fine arts. If a new
ommission, with jurisdiction over many of the Government's art activities, is
stablished, as contemplated in the bill, there would probably arise a conflict
f duties which should, if possible, be avoided.

The Commission of Fine Arts favors the enactment of H. R. 464, "To provide
r the establishment of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House, and
r other purposes", which was introduced by Congressman Kearns on January 3,
953, and provides for the erection and administration of an opera house by the
ffice of General Services Administration.

I should also add that, in recent months, the Commission has been in corre-
erence with representatives of departments and agencies of the government, as
ll as representatives of art organizations in the United States, on the sub-
ect of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of art. This
urvey has been made at the request of the President, who in January 1951
sked the Commission of Fine Arts to make such a survey and recommendations as
how these activities could be more effectively coordinated or further
eveloped. The Commission has completed its report; and when it has been sub-
tted to the President, I shall be glad to send you a copy, if you so desire,
r your own use and that of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd. David E. Finley,
Chairman.

onorable H. Alexander Smith, Chairman
ommittee on Labor and Public Welfare
nited States Senate, Washington D. C. DEF\amv

EXHIBIT 1